

PATENT  
App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 24, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 24, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-42 and 45-53 are pending in the application. Claims 10-20, 33-42 and 45-51 remain pending following entry of this response. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-4, 7-23 and 26-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JavaServerPages by Hans Bergsten (hereinafter, *Bergsten*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,523 to DellaFera et al (hereinafter, *DellaFera*).

Claims 2, 5-6 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bergsten* in view of *DellaFera* et al as applied to claim 1 and 10 above and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0184308 to Levy et al (hereinafter, *Levy*).

Claims 1-9, 21-32, 43-44, 48-49, and 52-53 have been cancelled. Regarding the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as follows.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

Page 10

487487\_1

PATENT  
App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion. For example, the references, even when combined as suggested in the Office Action, fail to teach, at a first server, extracting an internationalization context from a second request, processing a first request using the internationalization context extracted from the second request, attaching the internationalization context to the first request, and propagating the first request with the attached internationalization context to an application associated with an application interface on a second server, as recited in independent claims 10, 33, and 45.

The Examiner relies on *Bergsten* as teaching some of the claimed elements, but acknowledges that *Bergsten* "fails to teach a request to invoke a Remote procedure call and received from the client device and further configured to generate a second request to invoke a second remote procedure call, to attach the context to the second request and to propagate the second request to an application associated with an application interface on a second server." The Examiner relies on *DellaFera* as teaching these missing elements. However, Applicants submit *DellaFera* also fails to teach these missing elements.

*DellaFera* teaches a server receiving a remote procedure call (RPC), with a request-context marshaled into the call. The server then unmarshalls and stores the request-context. If the server requires assistance from another server, the server issues an RPC to the other server and marshalls the request-context into the outgoing call. See col. 5, line 57 – col. 6, line 10. However, *DellaFera* fails to teach processing a first request using internationalization context extracted from a second request, attaching the internationalization context to the first request, and propagating the first request with the attached internationalization context to an application associated with an application interface on a second server, as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 10, 33, and 45, as well as their dependents, allowable, and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Page 11

487467\_1

**PATENT**  
App. Ser. No.: 09/870,319  
Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010082US1  
PS Ref. No.: IBMK10082

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read  
Registration No. 43,876  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicant(s)